A U M

Just as wave and foam, eddy and bubble are in their nature water; so, from the body to the personality, all is consciousness, the pure essence of consciousness.
—*Crest Jewel of Wisdom.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXX February, 1942 No. 4

DAY OF RECKONING

THERE is a stage in the life of every disciple where he sees the inferiority of "sacrifice made with material things," yet has not himself begun to practice "sacrifice through spiritual knowledge." Intellectually, this is the position of the pessimist and the cynic; morally, it is the tragic situation of the despondent Arjuna.

To suffer the death of ambition without the birth of altruism to take its place is a terrible experience. Nature tolerates no void, and the life of one who has realized the futility of all personal aims requires a new purpose to consume the energies which rise from the principles of his being. Otherwise, they will turn against each other, destroying themselves and him.

Sometimes a man reaches this point of his egoic evolution, and because he has not developed in himself the habit of *doing* for others, is unable to recognize the nature of the step which lies before him. So he falls back to a lower level, to the place of a "worshipper" who still performs sacrifices with material things. Yet inwardly, he knows that a betrayal has taken place; that all is not right in the course he has chosen, and to deafen his ears to the accusations of conscience he throws himself into his work with furious intensity. He grows in fanatic zeal; he may learn to hate those who oppose him, with all the force that might have been love. Denial of the inner voice grows into active nihilism, and by the very passion of his self-justification is born a strength of conviction that deceives many others into thinking that here, at last, is one who has found the way. Finally, the inner voice is silenced, the choice is made. In his next life he may be a Loyola, a Hæckel . . . and there are those today in whom we may see the dread penalties of soul-betrayal wreaking their tragedies upon the human race.

What is a Judas but a soul that would not face its destiny? The opportunity to betray comes only to those who have within them

the potentialities of Christ. Benedict Arnolds are never blind followers in the ranks. What seership was hidden behind the stained exterior of the Wilde who could cry,

> To drift with every passion till my soul
> Is a stringed lute on which all winds can play,
> Is it for this that I have given away
> Mine ancient wisdom and austere control?
> . . . lo! with a little rod
> I did but touch the honey of romance—
> And must I lose a soul's inheritance?

The Sinnetts and Humes, blind to the river of life-giving Brotherhood that flowed through the heart of H. P. B.; who saw in her only a distraught woman, instead of a victim of their own callous disregard, and in Olcott, devoted and true as he knew how, only the *gaucheries* of an American: how and when had they chosen thus?

There are lines of all these pasts running through the web of life made by each disciple: memories, dark and haunting, like clouds that will not shape into sensible figures; and sounds, sometimes plaintive, sometimes harsh, that crowd upon the inward ear.

It is no easy task to learn to see the currents in man's common life for what they are. Are we thrilling to the tocsin of the soul's awakening, or to the tortured dissonance of failure? Who are these that lead us on? What path do they tread, today and yesterday?

The soul is indeed a "stringed lute,"

> an Aeolian harp, chorded with two sets of strings, one made of pure silver, the other of catgut. When the breath from the divine Fiat brushes softly over the former, man becomes like unto *his* God—but the other set feels it not. It needs the breeze of a strong terrestrial wind, impregnated with animal effluvia, to set its animal chords vibrating.

Man's psychic nature is a moral barometer, if he will only learn to use it. Those who continually ask, How shall we know our duty? —have they ever listened to the harmony within themselves? The world about us is a din of vibration. It is the sound of the past actions of human beings. Like a great symphony, it has its themes and nuances, its brasses, strings and percussions. There are conductors visible and invisible. There are many compositions, all played at once. What baton do we follow, and what rhythm do we find our own?

Every current of thought in the world, once men act upon it, involves the mixed qualities of good and evil, the motivations of those who first set it going. This is the common heritage of human nature. We find in the constructions of those who have gone before us—in

the pattern of our institutions—written the ethics of our race. Every shibboleth is the shell of a forgotten moral precept, every sentimentality a spiritual idea fallen to the psychic plane. The forms of social life are the means by which men's motives—the true feelings behind their professions—are reduced to the terms of reality. The slum hidden behind the Church exposes the sleek hypocrisy of our forefathers. Today's sermon contains in seed the intellectual degeneration of our sons. Do we only echo, or build anew?

Is it "easy" to do our duty? Then it is not duty we love, but *ease*. What was our party a century ago? Do we admire it as it was then? De we bless fallacies because they image forth the weaknesses that we love in ourselves? Each man bears his own cross of sacrifices that he will not make. What are they? What burdens of the race is he failing to reduce? There are the little things in which we see "no harm." But lest some harm be present, we do not look too closely. And as man is so constituted that he ever seeks out harm, we find much that is evil in the big things that other men do. What are these petty faults of ours beside such monumental crimes! Thus the song of the catgut swells into a tempest.

The path of compromise brings an interminable gnawing at the moral vitals. It will not go away. Finally, it makes men mad. For human beings cannot do what they know is untrue to themselves and continue to live like other men. Moral infection usually takes one of two forms, either despair or brutal dominance. One is the giving up of good, the other, the taking of evil. Recovery lies in facing one's self; there is no other good to gain, no other evil to destroy.

The strength that men need to make them free does not belong to individuals. It lives and rises only in men whose hearts are joined. The futility of personal existence must end, but it can end in annihilation or in the forgetfulness of working for others. We should not forget that service is also a "way of life." Simple kindliness is a habit that may save a man from falling over a precipice of selfishness on his day of trial. A bit of gossip dying in the throat, may tomorrow save our reputations, preserving those we love from pain, ourselves from bitter denials.

Bricks in each man's own guardian wall are the hourly thoughts and acts. Some day, when the energy of personal life dies, he will need that wall more than all the truths and philosophies there are. It is the living truth in him. It is what he has made of his opportunities. The race is over, the harvest gathered. Winter has come and he must live on the fruit of his labors. It is the hour when he must stand alone.

FIGURES OF THE TRANSITION AGE

Before Satan, the incarnate PROTEST, repents and reunites with his fellow men in one common Brotherhood, all cause for protest must have disappeared from earth. And that can come to pass only when Greed, Bias, and Prejudice shall have disappeared before the elements of Altruism and Justice to all. Freedom, or Liberty, is but a vain word just now all over the civilized globe; freedom is but a cunning synonym for oppression of the people in the name of the people, and it exists for castes, never for units. To bring about the reign of Freedom . . . is a Utopia—for the present. It cannot take place before the castes of the modern *Levites* and their theology—the Dead-sea fruit of Spirituality—shall have disappeared. . . .

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, "The Fall of Ideals," *Lucifer,* December, 1889.

Any one who has followed the course of Christian apologetic during the last forty years must be aware that many of the links which have held traditional Christian doctrine together have now been abandoned. The miracles are no longer adduced as evidence; the virgin birth and empty tomb are found to have been afterthoughts of a later generation; the atonement is discreetly dropped and the resurrection story in any form is seen to present formidable difficulties. Position after position has been given up until all divinity of any value as doctrine has now been whittled away. Traditional theology now resembles a delicate and complicated instrument, worn with age and riddled with holes, which its upholders gravely assure one another, will work as well as ever if it is gently handled. In recent times it has resolved itself into pointing to the life and teaching of Jesus as set forth in the gospels, and asking if any higher conception of God could be imagined. If you want to know what God is like, it is said, read the Gospels. But this ground is no longer tenable. After nearly a century of research historical science has reached the conclusion that the life and message of Jesus is enveloped in a tissue of myth and legend.

—COL. T. B. LUARD, "Why I Don't Go to Church,"
Hibbert Journal, April, 1937.

RECENT developments in the world of Protestant thought have caused a number of observers to comment favorably on the progressive tendencies in modern Christianity, but what these writers seldom point out is the fact that the "progress" is almost always marked by a departure from forms and beliefs that are traditionally "Christian." The truth is that many Christians are doing their best to be honest with themselves, and live the Christ life, which brings them into direct conflict with the sectarianism of the churches. When enough of these reformers realize that organized

Christianity must die out before true religion can be born, another great Reformation, that of the twentieth century, will begin.

The emancipation of the western mind began hundreds of years ago, with the birth of modern physical science. After the downfall of medieval cosmology, the activities of the personal Creator who was alleged to be "outside of Nature" were gradually assumed by the natural powers and forces disclosed in scientific research. Eventually, Charles Kingsley could write that the clergy "find that they have got rid of an interfering God—a master-magician as I call it—and have to choose between the absolute empire of accident and a living, immanent, ever-working God." It is now often acknowledged that if Christianity is to exist on friendly terms with scientific knowledge, God must be conceived in pantheistic terms. But the fact that Pantheism is not "Christian" at all, being rather a pagan heresy, is quietly ignored by those who welcome this manifestation of progress.

Loss of the Old Testament from the category of Divine Revelation brought new emphasis on the New Testament. Christians were urged to forget about the tribal God, Jehovah, and to find their religious ideal in the person of Jesus—"The one immeasurably great man who was strong enough to think himself the spiritual ruler of mankind and bend all history to his purposes." From this readjustment in the focus of Christian devotion, two difficulties arose.

The first problem was in the metaphysics of the Incarnation. Was Jesus man or God? How could he have been both man *and* God? If he was mostly God, how can men hope to imitate him? If mostly man, why should we revere him above other saintly individuals? The logical absurdities of the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation are a source of great irritation to intelligent Christians, one of whom, John Campbell Graham, heaps richly deserved ridicule on the English Church for failing to reform its teaching on this subject. Writing in the *Hibbert Journal,* Mr. Graham quotes the Doctrinal Report of the Archbishop's Commission of the Church of England for an authoritative statement of the Dogma. The Commission held:

> The classical formula of the doctrine of the Incarnation is that reached by the Council of Chalcedon. . . . the main upshot of this formula is plainly the affirmation of real and absolute Deity and of real and absolute humanity in the one Christ. . . . In all His actions and experiences He is both God and Man.

Mr. Graham comments:

> The theology of the Incarnation exhibits the strange paradox that while the various heresies condemned by the Church have for the most part the merit of being intellectually tenable, the orthodox

doctrine is, from a theological point of view (for nothing can be truly theological that is not logical), the greatest heresy of them all.[1]

The doctrine of the Incarnation contradicts itself in asserting and denying the same thing at the same time and in the same sense. Jesus Christ simply could not be at once both omniscient and not omniscient, both God and rational animal in "all his actions and experiences." Not unless, that is, God is taken as the divine spirit in all beings, and limitation regarded as a characteristic of all its finite manifestations. But this latter solution would be possible only by making Christianity into a Pantheistic religion. Then the doctrine of the Incarnation would apply to *all* men, and Christ would be recognized as a principle instead of a person; in short, it would no longer be a "Christian" doctrine.

The second difficulty of the "religion of Jesus" is in the alleged historical existence of Jesus himself. Most Christians are unaware that historical research and Bible criticism have quite literally destroyed all foundation for belief in the traditional figure of Jesus Christ. Typical of the conclusions of modern students of the Jesus problem are the numerous works of the German historian, Arthur Drews (1865-1935). The transition in Christian thought represented by the fruit of his investigations may be regarded as the last step in iconoclasm, leaving the popular Jesus-image devoid of any connection with the facts of history. The following summary is based on various of Drews' works.

Of a historical Jesus, Drews contends, there is no evidence whatever. The Gospels could not have been written by eyewitnesses, and, if analyzed, rather disprove than prove his existence. A close examination reveals that not a single word in the Gospel of St. Mark has a historical foundation. The entire Gospel is based on Old Testament prophecies and on astronomical considerations. The other evangelists are said to have copied from Mark, and where, then, is the "historicity" of any of the Gospels?

It is claimed that a spiritual movement of such vast proportions as Christianity can be explained only as resulting from the life and work of such a personality as Jesus. Yet early Christian writings disclose no trace of this "powerful personality," and Paul knows only the dogmatic Christ. For Drews, the whole story of Jesus is an invention of the Church, providing historical background for the imaginary personage to whom its dogmas are traced. One who realizes the fact of this deception can no longer be a Christian. He

[1] "Fast and Loose in Theology," *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1939.

finds himself compelled to renounce religion altogether, or seek a faith that will satisfy the demands of his reason.

Drews argues that a "true" Christian must believe that God actually descended to earth nineteen hundred years ago in the form of his son; that he died on the cross for the sins of mankind; that he rose from the grave and entered into heaven; and finally, that this "coming of Christ" was in order that all men may at death be united with him in paradise, or, failing to believe, be condemned to hell. One who does not accept these ideas, though the wisest or best of men—even a pillar of the Church—is certainly not a Christian!

The average Christian, Drews points out, has only the vaguest impressions of what the Scriptures really say about Jesus. For the majority, Jesus is merely an ideal figure constructed from hazy recollections of Bible stories heard in childhood. Later, when the New Testament is read, the Gospel accounts are simply added to these first impressions, without any critical evaluation. This, Drews suggests, explains the curious fact that every Christian can find in Jesus precisely the qualities he is looking for.

A devastating exposure of the wishful thinking of all orthodox accounts of the life of Jesus is presented by Ray Knight, writing on Christian Origins. He collects facts showing that the earliest Christians knew very little if anything at all of Jesus the *man*. "Nothing," he says, "is heard of parables or miracles, Temptation, Transfiguration, Entry into Jerusalem, or Purging of the Temple until the second century." He continues:

> Clearly the foundation-stone of orthodox belief was shifting quicksand in the '50's. The sayings and doings of the Ministry, it is perforce admitted, "did not interest" St. Paul and his disciples; how could they have failed to interest them? Credal incidents apart, Barnabas, Ignatius, Hermas, and the others knew nothing whatever about the "great historical truths" of Christianity. Paul's own testimony or the lack of it is decisive. The Christ of his inspiration is not the Galilean prophet but a spirit akin to the Socratic daimon. So far from acknowledging a human predecessor in his mission, he insists not once but many times that he and no other is author of the revelation, to him alone has been committed the revealing of it. Nowhere does he say or suggest, "this that I preach was preached by Christ himself only a little time ago, and there are many yet alive who heard him"; on the contrary, he disclaims all interest in a Christ of flesh and blood. How could he pretend that Christ was raised from the dead according to *his* gospel if it was not his but Christ's, preached all up and down Judea at that moment by witnesses of an event known to him only through ecstatic vision? And

> they who companied with the Lord Jesus all the time that he went in and out among them, listened to his teachings, marvelled at his deeds, enjoyed the powers he bestowed upon them, and communed with him after the Resurrection, could teach their converted persecutor nothing!
>
> The facts are as fatal to the Higher Criticism as to orthodox belief. The churches tell us that many of these early Christians were privileged to know the most extraordinary man who ever trod the earth, wonder-working, victorious over death, the very God incarnate, but instead of falling prostrate before so tremendous a personality, instead of recording every deed, word, and gesture with jealous reverence, they who were charged to carry his message to the world spend their time in wrangling over policies and metaphysics without so much as mention of their Master's teaching. . . . Son of God or unexampled genius, the Galilean prophet is ignored by his disciples in all save name and mythic history. Not that which Jesus did and said but that which the Christ experiences, Virgin Birth, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension, is the whole original belief.[2]

The "liberal" Jesus, constructed by critics like Sweitzer, is as difficult to believe in as the old orthodox "Son of God," for while he attains at their hands the stature of an inspiring prophet and reformer, he is found to teach doctrines of "supernaturalism" which the liberal Christians themselves refuse to take literally. If Jesus was but a man, with beliefs very much like the liberals of today, and who left among his followers only some ethical precepts, then what of all the miraculous elements of the Gospels and the teaching of immortality? Was Jesus a dual personality, half Jewish Epictetus, half apocalyptic fanatic? A modern theologian sums up the results of such "naturalistic" interpretation:

> The Jesus who emerges from its labors is sometimes a simple-minded lover of God, who is crushed between the political and theological wheels of His day; sometimes an ethical teacher of high value; sometimes a dreamy enthusiast, who died because He deluded Himself into the belief that He was the Messianic King. The Gospels, as manipulated by the uncertain methods of this sort of criticism, seem capable of yielding a picture of any sort of Jesus that the critic desires.[3]

Plainly, there is not a shred of *knowledge* available concerning the man or God called Jesus Christ, either from the theologians or the historians. Yet, according to one eminent authority, "personal attachment to Christ is the one essential" to being a Christian. What,

---

[2] "Silence as to the Ministry of Jesus in Early Christian Belief," *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1938.

[3] Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* IV, 320a.

then, is the Christ to whom the Christian must be attached? The fact of the matter is that Christ has been reduced to "Love," and that the whole of the Christian religion, when analyzed, has nothing more to offer than this single idea. As John Campbell Graham puts it: "The doctrine of the Incarnation is valued only as an expression of the Divine Love; the doctrine of the Divine Love (which is now coming to be called the doctrine of Agape) remains the supreme and fundamental affirmation of the Christian faith."[4]

From this simple conception there follow some searching questions, several of which are asked by an English Vicar, Reginald F. Rynd:

> If [he writes] the "religion" of Jesus was the religion of "love," what evidence have we of its presence or power in the predatory and grossly material aims of four-fifths of those who make up the society to which we belong? Is it a matter of individual salvation and the necessity of not allowing sin to "reign in our mortal bodies" or is this no more than an echo from a world long dead when the devil was a reality and hell gaped for souls that had not sought the shelter of redemption? If Jesus did not demand any credal test or criterion for membership in the community of believers what right has the Church to do so? Is Christianity an "other-worldly" religion with its aims and aspirations focused on heaven or is it intended to realize itself under the contingent and eternally changing aspects of history and create on earth that "kingdom" or spiritual polity that underlies so much of the teachings of Jesus? If the latter is the true account of it where are we to find the necessary impulse to create this kingdom, in the Catholic Church which already claims to be the earthly pattern of the New Jerusalem or in one of the endless forms of the Protestant "evangel," united in nothing but their deep and abiding distrust of each other?[5]

Intellectually honest Christians find it intolerable that these questions should be evaded, or met with only vague generalizations saturated with "sweetness and light." So frequent and so forceful have become the demands of the intelligent laity for something more definite than preachments on the inestimable value of tradition and ritual, that the young man who becomes an ecclesiastic is in danger of being marked by his fellows as either stupid, or ignorant, or—what is far worse—insincere. Three years ago, in an article previously quoted, John Campbell Graham described the situation of the English Church:

> Not only is it becoming increasingly difficult to get men "of average intelligence and conscientiousness" to take holy orders,

---

[4] "Fast and Loose in Theology," *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1938.
[5] "What Does It Mean To Be a Christian?" *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1940.

> but it is difficult to get such men to take any interest in Christianity at all. . . . It is urged that revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles would disrupt the Church. The risk must be faced. The secession of the intelligentsia can have only one result: there will soon be no Church left to disrupt.

With this statement, the problem leaves the realm of theological debate and enters the realm of fact—the fact that the religious structure of the western world is disintegrating before our eyes. The same general conditions are faced by American Protestants. What is to become of institutional Christianity? Through what other channels will flow the energies of the men who refuse to continue their work under the limitations imposed by orthodoxy?

One prominent English clergyman, Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, recently won world-wide attention and the benediction of the Communist Party with his book, *Soviet Power,* in which he maintains that the Communists are the real Christians of today! A less fantastic and more substantial movement is that headed by Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of York, second ranking English prelate. In January of last year, he and twenty-three of the Church of England's ninety-eight bishops, fourteen deans and 200 other churchmen met in conference at Malvern College to formulate plans for the new society they believed "quite evidently emerging" from the war. As reported in *Time,* the program of these English liberals "was little short of revolutionary." In brief—

> It called for unification of Europe in a cooperative commonwealth, communal ownership of the means of production, more religion and less liturgy. On the negative side it condemned the profit motive and the Church's own financial dependence on ancient perquisites and levies. (*Time,* Jan. 20, 1941.)

Resolutions incorporating these views were unanimously adopted, and a "very large majority" of the conferees subscribed to the still more sweeping amendment offered by Sir Richard Acland, liberal M. P. The latter affirmed:

> . . . the ownership of the great resources of our community . . . [by] private individuals is a stumbling block. . . . The time has come, therefore, for Christians to proclaim the need for seeking some form of society in which this stumbling block will be removed.

Dr. Temple told the conference that the present war is not "an isolated evil detached from the general condition of western civilization," but "one symptom of widespread disease and maladjustment." We need, he said, "a new order of society—a new integration of religion, morals, politics and economics."

Last March the Malvern resolutions were adopted in substance by the American Church League for Industrial Democracy, a liberal group in the Episcopal Church.

Christianity is wholly lacking in philosophy; this is at the root of the necessity under which Christians find themselves of turning to secular theories of social reform. Their lack of philosophy, moreover, is ignored by Christian thinkers. There is unlimited expatiation on the power of "love" and the need for a return to Jesus, but no real facing of the problem of where the suffering and evil in the world comes from. It is not even realized that the presence of evil in human life requires a philosophical explanation. Religious liberals feel secure in their neglect of metaphysics because of the general contempt for philosophy expressed by most scientists.

The psychological mysteries of human nature are likewise untouched by the simple theology of "love." While here and there one finds individual Christian psychologists who have blended the less offensive doctrines of psychoanalysis with religious sentiments, such theories are highly personal and without clear basis in principles.

One of the larger eddies following in the wake of the Theosophical Movement has been the revival of mystical theology according to the Christian tradition. For some years now, European scholars and journalists who have come under the psychic spell of the Orient have been producing book after book on so-called "Yoga Philosophy," often with specific directions on how to practice Hatha Yoga. Analogies between the psychic lore of the East and Christian mysticism were soon recognized, and a number of publishers, chiefly in England, have reprinted the works of famous saints and mystics of the Middle Ages. So intense is the modern preoccupation with the "mystic way" that the word "saint" is acquiring contemporary significance in Christian circles, and "contemplation" and "meditation" are losing their historical flavor. Evelyn Underhill's writings on Christian Mysticism have a large following in England, and in America the scholarly studies of the Quaker leader, Rufus Jones, have greatly stimulated interest in the subject. Two other writers are exercising a wide influence—Aldous Huxley and Gerald Heard. Huxley's brilliant literary art has for several years been devoted to exploring the mystical approach to Reality—although not without several backward glances at the forsaken pleasures of the wicked world; Heard, more religious in spirit, is virtually the founder of a cult of modern mysticism on the Pacific Coast. As these tendencies increase, taking on more definite form, future years may see an

actual reincarnation of medieval Quietism in America, supplemented, of course, by the theories of the "yogis," and of westerners who have come home from India and Tibet with rules for breathing exercises.

Here, again, is seen the tragic result of Christian ignorance of metaphysics and true psychology. Unable to distinguish between the psychic and the spiritual, Christians who adventure along the road of occult discipline, without reference-points of philosophy for their guide, may end as blind enthusiasts for their own special revelations, intoxicated by the sights and sounds of the astral world.

But whatever the philosophical weaknesses of Christianity, these criticisms should not be interpreted as condemning Christians. It is rather the moral vitality of these currents in contemporary religion and the earnest resolve of Christians to live lives effective for good that make these weaknesses so clearly evident. A striking instance of Christian sincerity lies in the fact that the return to Christ has brought astonishing strength to the Christian Pacifist Movement. At present far more ministers are maintaining the non-violent position they preached during peace time, than was the case in the first World War. Right or wrong, these preachers are braving the intolerance of the vast majority for what they conceive to be their Christian duty. They take the position that they think Christ would have taken. And so with most Christian pacifists and conscientious objectors who offer purely religious reasons for objecting to war. Their stand, however, further illustrates the limitations of a religion of personal example. As to the *causes* of war, the Christian can add nothing that has not been said before, and he is often unable to support his position on the rational grounds of historical and humanist argument. Nor has the Christian pacifist any satisfactory explanation of why so many worthy men cannot be pursuaded to accept the Christian way of Love. What is sufficient for him, he supposes, ought to be sufficient for everyone else.

As a personal credo which satisfies a few devotionally minded people, the doctrine of Agape may do well enough, but the rest of the world is more tough-minded; Christianity, as the unique solution to the tremendous moral problems confronting present-day civilization, is hopelessly inadequate. The failure of Christians to face this fact is responsible for their failure to command the attention of the intelligent, non-sectarian public.

In one of her articles on "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels," a series forming a definitive study of the Christian religion, H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

> Belief in the Bible *literally,* and in a *carnalized* Christ, will not last a quarter of a century longer. The Churches will have to part with their cherished dogmas, or the twentieth century will witness the downfall and ruin of all Christendom, and with it, belief even in a Christos, as pure Spirit. The very name has now become obnoxious, and theological Christianity must die out, *never to resurrect again* in its present form. (THEOSOPHY IV, 135.)

Students of Theosophy do not always regard such prophecies recorded in the philosophy with sufficient gravity. When H. P. B. said that Europe was on the verge of a cataclysm which her own racial Karma had led her to, she *meant* it. When Mr. Judge predicted the relapse of western civilization, particularly in America, into the worst forms of anarchy, as the result of falsely glorifying selfish individualism into a political dogma, he did not speak idly. And there were good reasons behind his further statement that "the people will rise"; that here in America, a nation still in its youth must suffer more rapidly than older cultures the disturbing effects of false philosophy.

All these statements were intended to be taken literally. They are not "symbolic." They were meant to show the Karmic Path trod by the western nations, without exception and without favoritism. H. P. B. said, just as unequivocally, that all talk of "freedom" and an end to oppression is mere vanity so long as Christian theology remains the established orthodoxy. It is this "Dead-sea fruit of Spirituality" which must die out before the incarnate *protest* can disappear from earth—before the deniers, the haters and destroyers will repent and reunite in brotherhood with their fellow men.

At the present hour we are witnessing, in large measure, the "downfall and ruin of all Christendom," a fate which, if the Theosophic conception of history be true, is directly attributable to the moral lethargy and hypocrisy of a culture virtuously calling itself "Christian" while practicing the most ruthless selfishness in both private and public undertakings. The Churches have not really parted with their cherished dogmas, but cling to exclusive beliefs and sectarian differences as though they were life itself. It is individual Christian men and women, better than their creeds, who are declaring themselves separate from organized Christianity, who are breaking with outworn tradition and beginning to think for themselves. For theological Christianity, this is the beginning of the end. Theology can survive anything but intelligent and independent thinking. It must have been with this, and other great changes in mind, that H. P. Blavatsky wrote in 1887:

> The nineteenth century is close to its death. The twentieth century has strange developments in store for humanity, and may even be the last of its name.

QUEST FOR AUTHORITY

EVERY time a man makes up his mind and acts, his whole nature is polarized, unified, that is, by the force of motive. Before the final decision is made, it is possible for opposing currents of thought to exist in his mind. He has then to compare before choosing between the "better" and the "dearer"; or, after the moral phase of the choice is past, between the more and the less intelligent way of carrying out his resolve. But when the action is undertaken, he cannot be of two minds. If inwardly, he should still be undecided, the course, whatever it may be, will surely prove disastrous.

The problem of choice is really the problem of authority. On what or whom shall the decision be based? The egoic development of the incarnated chooser is measured by the manner in which he answers this question. If, in forming his judgment with respect to alternative paths, the man's mind is at once drawn to the image of some other *person,* with the query, What would *he* think is best? then that man, whatever his nominal religion or philosophy, is still a victim of the Personal God idea.

There is a vast difference between consulting with another about the principles that may be involved in a decision, and the wish to rely on the actual choice of that other. To refuse to consult; to assume, that is, that the ideas of other men are of no value in connection with a given problem, is not at all the position of true self-reliance. Self-reliance is founded on the study of principles, and the wise man leaves no source of light without consideration in his attempt to learn the principles of things.

Sometimes it appears that we can do no better than take the opinion of another, more or less blindly. In cases where highly specialized knowledge is required, it may be folly to insist upon our own view of the matter. Here, however, it should be noted that there is no such thing as a *moral* specialist on whom men need rely. The expert is qualified to say what is accurate and what is efficient. He may say what he thinks is right, and when asked, give the reasons for his opinion. He has both the right and the obligation so to express himself. But if a man offers to tell what is *moral* for *others,* then he is no expert at all, but simply another priest.

Unfortunately, the centuries of sacerdotalism have left their mark upon the West, and all too few, in time of crisis, have learned to prefer the counsel of the sage to the command of the priest. There is a peculiarly unbearable anguish attached to the feeling of not

knowing "what is right," and this can be avoided by accepting the judgment of someone else whom we have come to admire. An easy sense of moral security results, and the mind is no longer disturbed by vague questionings.

The average man has a hierarchy of "authorities" covering decisions of various types. For his politics, he turns to the editorial columns of his newspaper, or possibly he recalls the views of some speaker who sounded "logical." In medical problems, his doctor settles all questions, and here the prestige of scientific knowledge renders ineffective any faint qualms that may question the fitness of orthodox practice. Moral problems seldom disturb the average man, until they are brutally brought home to him in association with the ravages of crime, economic tragedy, or personal misfortune. And then it is often the case that his own powers of moral decision are so weakened by lack of use that he welcomes the explicit guidance of another.

Of all the various kinds of helplessness that afflict mankind, none is so pitiful as the moral helplessness of those who have lost their personal authorities. One habituated to the moral rule of another person, though he may have made the best possible decision by himself, is nevertheless in torment until he has gained the approval of his authority. He is simply unable to believe that he can be right without having been told what to do. And if there is no one to provide that assurance, the agony may become so great as to cause mental disorder.

From the occult point of view, the lover of personal authority is on the way to retrogression into the Elemental Kingdom. That is the fate of every medium who persists in abrogating his will. The elementals take their character from creative beings, and those who will not create for themselves must, sooner or later, return to the status of creatures. The lukewarm, it is said, Nature spews out of her mouth.

Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven! was the cry of Lucifer. Better the woes of moral choice on earth, than the inane, instinctual beatitude of mindless man. When there are no "orders," the time has come for Manas to assert itself, for the chooser to stand alone. Karma brings a man no greater blessing than the circumstance in which he must act by himself, without help and without hindrance.

Every step of growth is accompanied by pain. Growth means birth, and birth means travail. The man who suffers stands in the

archway of opportunity, and the suffering of having to choose for himself is of all opportunities the greatest. But it is not all pain. There is a kind of achievement in falling down by yourself, and picking yourself up, without any help. When a man makes a mistake from his own judgment, he at least learns. But if blind reliance on the judgment of others was involved in his choice, how can he possibly understand the factors which caused the error?

It might be said that it is far better to do wrong in the right way, than to do right in the wrong way! The purpose of life is not to be right: *it is to learn.*

THE PURE HEART

We never speak of a brilliant heart, but of a brilliant mind. We never refer to the warmth and radiance of intellect, but of heart-light. Brilliance is a cold, glittering surface light; the other bespeaks the luminous depths of Soul. The brain, symbol of our separate minds, needs union with the heart, symbol of our interdependent souls. The heart sends the life-blood coursing through the body entire, penetrates and nourishes even the brain. The intuitive and direct perceptive power of Buddhi includes and surpasses mental function.

Alien to the child-like heart are the withering doubts and suspicions of our critical minds. The gaze of intellect is piercing and alert, but chills the heart. The adulation gained by intellectual giants is indicative of separative, prideful achievement; hearts foster no worship, only loving response, emulation and consecration. Theosophy, the staff of life, is for the soul-hungry, heart-sore millions, not for the few. Intellects reach the handful of those like unto themselves; hearts in their compassion embrace and feed the many, those also like unto themselves.

The Self is seated in the hearts of all beings; thence proceed all feeling, all true life, all true conception. The feeling of the true in the heart is not deceived by this, that, or the other "thought"; one knows it for himself within himself. The mystery is himself. In the heart the God sits patient; his pure rays are merely veiled from us by our vain strivings and illusions. He will shine through upon us, if we will but open up our hearts, tenderly compassionate for others' pains and sorrows.

CYCLIC IMPRESSION AND RETURN AND OUR EVOLUTION

II

NOW then, this law of impressions I have been talking about can be illustrated in this way: If you look at one of these electric lights—take away all the rest, leaving one only, so as to have a better impression—you will find the light makes an image on the retina, and when you shut your eye, this bright filament of light made by a carbon in an incandescent lamp will be seen by you in your eye. You can try it, and see for yourselves. If you keep your eye closed and watch intently, you will see the image come back a certain number of counts, it will stay a certain number of counts, it will go away in the same length of time and come back again, always changing in some respect, but always the image of the filament, until at last the time comes when it disappears apparently because other impressions have rubbed it out or covered it over. That means that there is a return even in the retina of the impression of this filament. After the first time, the color changes each time, and so it keeps coming back at regular intervals, showing that there is a cyclic return of impression in the retina, and as Brother Thomas said this morning, if that applies in one place, it applies in every place. And when we look into our moral character we find the same thing, for as we have the tides in the ocean, explained as they say by the moon,—which in my opinion does not explain it, but of course, being no scientist, my view is not worth much—so in man we have tides, which are called return of these impressions; that is to say, you do a thing once, there will be a tendency to repeat itself; you do it twice, and it doubles in its influence, a greater tendency to do that same thing again. And so on all through our character shows this constant return of cyclic impression. We have these impressions from every point in space, every experience we have been through, everything that we can possibly go through at any time, even those things which our forefathers went through. And that is not unjust for this reason, that our forefathers furnished the line of bodily encasement, and we cannot enter that line of bodily encasement unless we are like unto it, and for that reason we must have been at some point in that cycle in that same line or family in the past, so that I must have had a hand in the past in constructing the particular family line in which I now exist, and am myself once more taking up the cyclic impression returning upon me.

NOTE.—Part I of this address by Wm. Q. Judge appeared in January.—Editors.

Now this has the greatest possible bearing upon our evolution as particular individuals, and that is the only way in which I wish to consider the question of evolution here; not the broad question of the evolution of the universe, but our own evolution, which means our bodily life, as Madame Blavatsky, repeating the ancients, said to us so often, and as we found said by so many of the same school. An opportunity will arise for you to do something; you do not do it; you may not have it again for one hundred years. It is the return before you of some old thing that was good, if it is a good one, along the line of the cycles. You neglect it, as you may, and the same opportunity will return, mind you, but it may not return for many hundred years. It may not return until another life, but it will return under the same law.

Now take another case. I have a friend who is trying to find out all about theosophy, and about a psychic nature, but I have discovered that he is not paying the slightest attention to this subject of the inevitable return upon himself of these impressions which he creates. I discovered he had periods of depression, (and this will answer for everybody) when he had a despondency that he could not explain. I said to him, you have had the same despondency maybe seven weeks ago, maybe eight weeks ago, maybe five weeks ago. He examined his diary and his recollection, and he found that he had actual recurrences of despondency about the same distance apart. Well, I said, that explains to me how it is coming back. But what am I to do? Do what the old theosophists taught us; that is, we can have these good results by producing opposite impressions to bad ones. So, take this occasion of despondency. What he should have done was, that being the return of an old impression, to have compelled himself to feel joyous, even against his will, and if he could not have done that, then to have tried to feel the joy of others. By doing that, he would have implanted in himself another impression, that is of joy, so that when this thing returned once more, instead of being of the same quality and extension, it would have been changed by the impression of joy or elation and the two things coming together would have counteracted each other, just as two billiard balls coming together tend to counteract each other's movements. This applies to every person who has the blues. This does not apply to me, and I think it must be due to the fact that in some other life I have had the blues. I have other things, but the blues never.

I have friends and acquaintances who have these desponding spells. It is the return of old cyclic impressions, or the cyclic return of impressions. What are you to do? Some people say, I just sit down

and let it go; that is to say, you sit there and create it once more. You cannot rub it out if it has been coming, but when it comes, start up something else, start up cheerfulness, be good to someone, then try to relieve some other person who is despondent, and you will have started another impression, which will return at the same time. It does not make any difference if you wait a day or two to do this. The next day, or a few days after will do, for when the old cyclic impression returns, it will have dragged up the new one, because it is related to it by association.

This has a bearing also on the question of the civilization in which we are a point ourselves.

Who are we? Where are we going? Where have we come from? I told you that the old Egyptians disappeared. If you inquire into Egyptian history, the most interesting because the most obscure, you will find, as the writers say, that the civilization seems to rise to the zenith at once. We do not see when it began. The civilization was so great it must have existed an enormous length of time to get to that height, so that we cannot trace it from its beginning, and it disappears suddenly from the sky; there is nothing of it left but the enormous remains which testify to these great things, for the ancient Egyptians not only made mummies in which they displayed the art of bandaging that we cannot better, but they had put everything to such a degree of specialization that we must conclude they had many centuries of civilization. There was a specialist for one eye and a specialist for the other, a specialist for the eyebrow, and so on. In my poor and humble opinion, we are the Egyptians.

We have come back again, after our five thousand or whatever years' cycle it is, and we have dragged back with us someone called the Semitic race, with which we are connected by some old impression that we cannot get rid of, and so upon us is impinged that very Semitic image. We have drawn back with us, by the inevitable law of association in cyclic return, some race, some personages connected with us by some acts of ours in that great old civilization now disappeared, and we cannot get rid of it; we must raise them up to some other plane as we raise ourselves.

I think in America is the evidence that this old civilization is coming back, for in the theosophical theory nothing is lost. If we were left to records, buildings and the like, they would soon disappear and nothing could ever be recovered; there never would be any progress. But each individual in the civilization, wherever it may be, puts the record in himself, and when he comes into the favorable circumstances described by Patanjali, an old Hindoo, when he gets

the apparatus, he will bring out the old impression. The ancients say each act has a thought under it, and each thought makes a mental impression; and when the apparatus is provided, there will then arise that new condition, in rank, place and endowment.

So we retain in ourselves the impression of all the things that we have done, and when the time comes that we have cycled back, over and over again, through the middle ages perhaps, into England, into Germany, into France, we come at last to an environment such as is provided here, just the thing physically and every other way to enable us to do well, and to enable the others who are coming after us. I can almost see them; they are coming in a little army from the countries of the old world to endeavor to improve this one; for here ages ago there was a civilization also, perhaps we were in it then, perhaps anterior to the ancient Egyptians. It disappeared from here, when we do not know, and it left this land arid for many thousands of years until it was discovered once more by the Europeans. The ancient world, I mean Europe, has been poisoned, the land has been soaked with the emanations, poisoned by the emanations of the people who have lived upon it; the air above it is consequently poisoned by the emanations from the land; but here in America, just the place for the new race, is an arable land which has had time over and over again to destroy the poisons that were planted here ages and ages ago. It gives us a new land, with vibrations in the air that stir up every particle in a man who breathes it, and thus we find the people coming from the old world seeming to receive through their feet the impressions of an American country. All this bears upon our civilization and race.

We are here a new race in a new cycle, and persons who know say that a cycle is going to end in a few years and a new one begin, and that that ending and beginning will be accompanied by convulsions of society and of nature. We can all almost see it coming. The events are very complete in the sky. You remember Daniel says, "A time, half a time, and a time," and so on, and people in the Christian system have been trying to find out the time when the time began, and that is just the difficulty. We do not know when the time began. And the only person who in all these many years has made a direct statement is Madame Blavatsky, and she said, "A cycle is ending in a few years, you must prepare." So that it was like the old prophets who came to the people and said, "Prepare for a new era of things, get ready for what you have to do." That is just what this civilization is doing. It is the highest, although the crudest, civilization now on the earth. It is the beginning of the great civilization

that is to come, when old Europe has been destroyed; when the civilizations of Europe are unable to do any more, then this will be the place where the new great civilization will begin to put out a hand once more to grasp that of the ancient East, who has sat there silently doing nothing all these years, holding in her ancient crypts and libraries and records the philosophy which the world wants, and it is this philosophy and this ethics that the Theosophical Society is trying to give you. It is a philosophy you can understand and practice.

It is well enough to say to a man, Do right, but after a while, in this superstitious era, he will say, Why should I do right, unless I feel like it? When you are showing these laws, that he must come back in his cycle; that he is subject to evolution; that he is a reincarnated pilgrim soul, then he will see the reason why, and then in order to get him a secure basis, he accepts the philosophy, and that is what the Theosophical Society and the theosophical movement are trying to do. Brother George Mead said the other day, in speaking of a subject like this, that the great end and aim is the great renunciation. That is, that after progressing to great heights, which you can only do by unselfishness, at last you say to yourself, "I may take the ease to which I am entitled." For what prevails in one place must prevail in another, and in the course of progress we must come at last to a time when we can take our ease, but if you say to yourself, "I will not take it, but as I know this world and all the people on it are bound to live and last for many thousand years more, and if not helped perhaps might fail, I will not take it but I will stay here and I will suffer, because of having greater knowledge and greater sensitiveness"—this is the great renunciation as theosophy tells us. I know we do not often talk this way, because many of us think that the people will say to us at once when we talk of the great renunciation, "I don't want it; it is too much trouble." So generally we talk about the fine progress, and how you will at last escape the necessity of reincarnation, and at last escape the necessity of doing this or that and the other, but if you do your duty, you must make up your mind when you reach the height, when you know all, when you participate in the government of the world—not of a town, but the actual government of the world and the people upon it—instead of sleeping away your time, you will stay to help those who are left behind, and that is the great renunciation. That is what is told of Buddha, and of Jesus. Doubtless the whole story about Jesus, which cannot be proved historically to my mind, is based upon the same thing that we call renunciation. He was crucified after two or three years' work, but we say it means that this being divine resolves he

will crucify himself in the eyes of the world, in the eyes of others, so that he can save men. Buddha did the same thing long before Jesus is said to have been born. The story that he made the great renunciation just means that which I have been telling you, instead of escaping from this horrible place, as it seems to us. For this is indeed horrible, as we look at it, surrounded by obstructions, liable to defeat at any moment, liable to wake up in the morning after planning a great reform, and see it dashed to the ground. Instead of escaping all that, he remained in the world and started his doctrine, which he knew at least would be adhered to by some. But this great doctrine of renunciation teaches that instead of working for yourself, you will work to know everything, to do everything in your power for those who may be left behind you, just as Madame Blavatsky says in the *Voice of the Silence,* "Step out of the sunshine into the shade, to make more room for others."

Isn't that better than a heaven which is reached at the price of the damnation of those of your relatives who will not believe a dogma? Is this not a great philosophy and a great religion which includes the salvation and regeneration, the scientific upraising and perfecting of the whole human family, and every particle in the whole universe, instead of imagining that a few miserable beings after seventy years of life shall enter into paradise, and then they look behind to see the torments in hell of those who would not accept a dogma?

What are these other religions compared with that? How any man can continue to believe such an idea as the usual one of damnation for merely unbelief I cannot comprehend. I had rather—if I had to choose—be an idolator of the most pronounced kind, who believed in Indra, and be left with my common reasoning, than believe in such a doctrine as that which permits me to suppose that my brother who does not believe a dogma is sizzling in hell while I, by simply believing, may enjoy myself in heaven.

Theosophists, if they will learn the doctrine and try to explain it, will reform this world. It will percolate everywhere, infiltrate into every stratum of society and prevent the need of legislation. It will alter the people, whereas you go on legislating and leaving this world's people as they are, and you will have just what happened in France. Capitalists in that day, in the day of the revolution—that is the royalists—oppressed the people. At last the people rose up and philosophers of the day instituted the reign of reason, and out of the reign of reason—mind you they had introduced there a beautiful idea of mankind, that idea struck root in a soil that was not prepared—came the practice of murdering other people by the whole-

sale until streams of blood ran all over France. So you see if something is not done to raise the people what the result will be. We have seen in Chicago the result of such acts, the mutterings of such a storm if the theosophical philosophy—call it by any other name you like—is not preached and understood. But if these old doctrines are not taught to the race you will have a revolution, and instead of making progress, in a steady, normal fashion, you will come up to better things through storm, trouble and sorrow. You will come up, of course, for even out of revolutions and blood there comes progress, but isn't it better to have progress without that? And that is what the theosophical philosophy is intended for. That is why the Mahatmas we were talking about, directing their servant H. P. Blavatsky, as they have directed many before, came out at a time when materialism was fighting religion and was about getting the upper hand, and once more everything moved forward in its cyclic way and these old doctrines were revivified under the guidance of the theosophical movement. They are doctrines that explain all problems and in the universal scheme give man a place as a potential god.

Conditions of Materialization

As Kamaloka is on the earth-plane and differs from its degree of materiality only in the degree of its plane of consciousness, for which reason it is concealed from our normal sight, the occasional apparition of such shells is as natural as that of electric balls and other atmospheric phenomena. Electricity as a fluid, or atomic matter (for Occultists hold with Maxwell that it is atomic), is ever, though invisibly, present in the air and manifests under various shapes, but only when certain conditions are present to "materialise" the fluid, when it passes from its own on to our plane and makes itself objective. Similarly with the *eidolons of the dead.* They are present around us, but being on another plane do not see us any more than we see them. But whenever the strong desires of living men and the conditions furnished by the abnormal constitutions of mediums are combined together, these *eidolons* are drawn—nay *pulled* down from their plane on to ours and made objective. This is necromancy; it does no good to the dead, and great harm to the living, in addition to the fact that it interferes with the law of nature.

—H. P. Blavatsky.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

Physics and Psychics

IN the *Scientific American* for February, 1941, occurs the following editorial passage:

> In this column 25 months ago, the belief was expressed that, until a really hard and actual physical working principle underlying the long-mysterious art of dowsing, divining, or water witching by forked boughs was discovered and identified, so that physical laboratory instruments could be substituted for the vague uncertainties of the human factor, any investigation of that art must necessarily remain premature. We did not deny that dowsers locate water—we believed, and still believe, they often do—but we wanted the physicists to take over the problem, take some of the occult-mystic obscurantist hocus-pocus out of it and work it out as an ordinary problem in physical research, leaving the mystics and occultists high, dry, and lonesome.

These sentiments deserve close examination in themselves, as a psychic phenomenon indicative of the mental barricades which truth must surmount unless content to arrive by duly sanctified channels. Here we find it stated that "investigation is premature" until "a really hard and actual physical working principle . . . was discovered and identified." How, may we ask, is such a principle to be discovered, until and unless such "premature" investigation is carried out? It is a simple matter of record that for a century or more, orthodox science refused to investigate "dowsing" at all, claiming that the idea was ridiculous on the face of it.

The statement further implies that no investigation can be worthy of the name in which the "vague uncertainties of the human factor" are involved. Aside from the fact that this should logically throw out of court the entire sciences of psychology (perhaps not a fatal loss), and of medicine, one wonders whether the individual capable of writing such a paragraph actually knows anything of the practical problems of human psychology involved in research on *any* obscure and difficult subject, no matter how "physical."

The closing sentence of the paragraph from the *Scientific American* deserves special notice from theosophists. The difficulties met in the world by the Ancient Science are in any case never from conflict with facts. Consistent readers of this Magazine are well aware of the manner in which scientists have been urged, directly and indirectly, to investigate the many obscure physical problems upon which only Theosophy has thrown real light, but which would be of great value to science in building an integrated view of the Universe, should

they be investigated and verified by means congenial to scientific men themselves.

In the sentence referred to are, first, an unfair accusation against the "dowsers"; second, an explicit determination to refuse to any but materialistic investigators the credit for any discovery of any kind. This is all of a pattern with what Theosophy itself has met at the hands of enthroned materialism from the beginning. Theosophists have been fairly familiar with the "dowsing" problem for many years, and have known not a few "dowsers," some invariably successful, some successful part of the time (like the physicists and geologists working on the same problems by other methods), and some who had very little success. Theosophically, dowsing is simply an interesting exemplification and proof of the manner in which the electro-magnetic forces of the human organism interlock with the invisible currents of natural forces which traverse space. But the typical "dowser" does not engage in "occult-mystic-obscurantist hocus-pocus." In fact, in the Occident, he does not engage in any notable discussion at all. He merely says that he can find water; when engaged for a job, tries to do it. If he succeeds, he suggests that any friend looking for water be referred to him, and departs. He does not know how he does it, does not pretend to know, and is not particularly interested in any explanation offered him, either Theosophic or scientific.

If he is an Oriental, he will sometimes offer an explanation which is substantially that given later in the *Scientific American* editorial, but which would be scornfully rejected in orthodox circles because the words are not Greco-Latin, and because the giver thereof wears no trousers. And he will explain only when very sure the explanation will not reach aspiring but unsuccessful competitors. They might understand it.

The *Scientific American* refers to *The Physics of the Divining Rod,* by two British scientists, Maby and Franklin, as follows:

> The investigation proved to be arduous and complex and the report is by no means sketchy. Boiled down to a painful degree, its many conclusions come approximately to this: Every material object and, especially, good conductors in the midst of relatively insulating media, is surrounded by secondary radiation from cosmic rays. The zones of this radiation from these objects can be definitely mapped out in space by means of several physical recording instruments of conventional type, including ionization counters; and, thus mapped out, they check with those mapped out by the ancient method of divining. The working basis of dowsing is the nerves and muscles of the operator, which act as natural ionization counters of electron

showers caused by the cosmic rays. One person in ten can learn the art. Both authors learned it.

With the further comment:

It is particularly pleasing, however, to note that our early suspicion that dowsing was not a fake, but has a true physical basis, is apparently verified. The new report will not altogether please those few scientists who all along have pooh-poohed dowsing *in toto* (without looking into it). Those whom it really will most displease are the occult-minded, for it substitutes the ordinary for the nebulous, the known and commonplace for the mysterious which, to that type of mental makeup, is always the more attractive.

So cosmic rays are "ordinary, known, and commonplace"? And no mystery exists in the question of *how* the nerves act as ionization counters for them? Is there nothing "mysterious" or "nebulous" about an "art" which, though based on "known and common-place" qualities belonging to everyone with a nervous system, can be learned by only one in ten? (Further investigation would probably show the proportion to be more like one in seven; and theosophists would not be surprised if a certain phrase, "first-born of the ether," which occurs in *The Secret Doctrine,* might have application to this capacity.)

Nothing is more persistent or logically unaccountable than the materialistic delusion that to name a thing is to have understood it. Yet that delusion has served, from the day of Mesmer on, to confound and deprecate everything smacking of "occultism." Let any long-denied phenomenon, claimed to be actual by "occultism," be proved a fact, some of its rationale discovered, and a scientific name given it—and behold, as by a miracle, all at once it is the original discoverers and upholders who are the fools, not those who blindly denied; and no matter how the "occultists" may have striven to explain the matter in available terminology, the explanation only became valid when put in scientific language.

Unquestionably, there are many "occultists" well deserving of the above-mentioned criticisms. "Hocus-pocus" and nebulosity are not uncommon in the race mind, and we venture to state that they exist in at least as high a proportion in politics and the social field as they do in "occultism." But the existence of a "lunatic" fringe around the Ancient Wisdom no more condemns the validity of that Science than Sunday-supplement science condemns the work of Jeans and Eddington. The real obstacle to recognition of the truth in occult science is just such phobias as the *Scientific American* editorial exemplifies. Mainly it is simply vanity of learning and achievement which cannot brook the thought of prior and greater knowledge.

Implicit in such prejudice is the assumption that occultism is "miracle-minded." This is undoubtedly true of pseudo-occultism, but the fundamental contention of Theosophy always has been that there are no "miracles" and that belief in the latter arose from misunderstandings of natural phenomena. The real ground of disagreement lies in the vaster scope ascribed to "nature" by Theosophy.

An unconscious but caustic commentary on the trend of the *Scientific American* editorial occurs in comments on astrology by the *New York Times,* Dec. 12, 1937:

> The old physical universe, already tottering under the savage blows of the world's Nobel Prize heavyweights, received its final K. O. from a couple of slugging American scientists. They have deprived the physical universe of "its last vestiges of reality." . . . and our correspondent in Philadelphia says that the physical universe has been reduced to "an abstract mathematical ghost which feeds on Greek letter symbols."

The *Times* writer is sarcastically pointing out that while astrologers ascribe events to the stars, science has shown that there aren't any stars; but he is correctly representing the most advanced scientific thought. This thought has eliminated physics in the materialistic sense at the moment that the *Scientific American* accepts dowsing because of its having been put on just such a physical basis. It would seem time for the head and the tail of the scientific serpent of wisdom to come to agreement, lest indeed the one devour the other in earnest.

The simple and profound underlying fact is that everything manifest presents two aspects: a *proximate* aspect which can be grasped by the senses, and an *ultimate* aspect which is surrounded by mystery. No physical phenomenon has ever been *completely* known, nor ever will be, in physical terms. Just beyond the range of normal sense perceptions lies the plane of "astral" manifestations—no further from the normal range of sight, in fact, than the "ultra-violet" is beyond the visible solar spectrum. Drugs, drink, dreams, mediumism or *adeptship* reveal those regions to otherwise normal persons, and there are not a few natural "clairvoyants" who see in them more or less clearly. To science they are pure superstition, fancy, or invention. Yet any scientist with normal eyesight, materialist or otherwise, can be shown the "astral" body of man with entirely "normal" or physical methods. The secret has been accidentally revealed more than once; and lost again—perhaps not altogether "accidentally."

What is the scientific conclusion, so far as it goes? Why, that these phenomena, now that they have been seen, are necessarily "physical" after all; and of course, all the "mystics" who had claimed their

existence for some thousands of years are fools and obscurantists as usual, not being versed in modern Greco-Latin!

Anything that can be perceived by the senses is "physical" to him possessing the senses.

Anything previously unperceived, but made visible by some aid to the normal senses, thereupon becomes "physical."

Anything seen by the development of abnormal senses, becomes "physical" to the possessor of those senses.

In other words, any object of perception is physical—in the scientific sense—to him who perceives; any existence unperceived is inferable, deducible, or "mystic" to him who does not perceive it.

Such is the basic outlook of materialism; and materialism will still be materialism millions of years hence when "astral" existence will have become the norm and present "physical" matter a memory and a tradition.

The existence of malevolent men having great "occult" powers is an important teaching of Theosophy; and there are those unfortunates in the ranks, once sceptical, who have had direct evidence of the existence of such powers—when they tried to go too far, too fast, while yet unfit. Some have asked how it is possible for one of such great knowledge to have acquired it without at the same time learning better than to use it in that manner. The answer is: *Simply by exerting unusual intelligence and will-power along "occult" lines while retaining the "physical" basis of thought exemplified above.*

The materialistic, miscalled "scientific," viewpoint, is that all is matter, and all phenomena are manifestations of matter in different degrees of concretion. The Theosophic viewpoint is that all is spirit and all phenomena are manifestations of spirit at different levels of objectivity. The self-same *facts* will be obtained by assiduous search from either standpoint. The self-same facts will damn in the one case and save in the other. The "black adept" is the man who has discovered that the "astral" plane is physical. The White adept is he who has found that the physical plane is spiritual. The power—and the ultimate depth of damnation—of the "black adept" is measured by the height of the "astral" planes that he has mastered and brought under the "laws of physics"—as far as he is concerned.

Obviously, there is "black magic" ruling the minds of some who are not black magicians. Those who do not become sorcerers are those who see the fallacy in time. This time is better than some future time.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

FOR our remaining time tonight we were going to discuss the modern university," said Gail. "What are we going to do with it? It's a big subject, and the trouble is only about half of us are fortunate or unfortunate enough to be attending one at the present time."

"Well," answered Martinez, "I think those of us who aren't going to college need to learn something about an influence on the race mind that they haven't had a chance to contact directly. After all, we meet the *results* of the university type of thinking many times when we try to interest people in Theosophical ideas, and since we do meet the results, we should probably know something about the causes—that is, how and where the 'university outlook' germinates."

"I think the best way to understand how college influences a person's mind in respect to receptivity to Theosophy," said King, "is to talk with someone who has never thought very much except in the college frame of reference. So I'm glad I was able to bring Brother Bill here for us to work on. I know he won't mind being Exhibit A, since by this time he is probably very anxious to debate some of the Theosophical tenets we've been discussing. Let me hasten to say, however," he added, glancing at his large and pleasant looking fraternity brother, "that Bill must have some kind of interest in Theosophy, because he always wants to argue about it. He wanted to come down some night, anyway—maybe to see whether all the Theosophists are as hopeless as I am! Let's invite him to tell us why he thinks it's a waste of time to talk about Reincarnation and Karma."

"Hey, look!" grumbled Bill, "I'm outnumbered. Well, I guess I'd like to hear what different ones have to say to my objections, though, so here goes. My fundamental argument is that belief never does anything for anyone except let him fool himself. Look at all the religions. Have they ever made people very happy no matter how terrific a faith they've had? Myself, I don't like to accept anything unless it's been proved and I don't see how any of you can prove the ideas you talk about or get anywhere very constructive in your thinking, because you can never be really sure yourself about the things you believe. Maybe out at school you don't learn much that makes you happy either, but at least they use the scientific method so you can be sure of what you do hear."

"That's a debatable point right there," objected Gail. "We think that Theosophy is more thoroughly scientific than all the courses we get in school, because it recognizes the need of explaining things

that biology and psychology don't even admit need explanation."

"But what is so scientific about 'the reincarnating soul' and things like that you can never see?" protested Bill. "When you study conditioned reflexes in psychology you know about some of the things that make people act the way they do. I don't think its fair to stick in a hypothesis about 'soul' when we're finding out more and more in the laboratory all the time. Besides, according to the Principle of Parsimony, as formulated by Sir William Hamilton—"

"Whoa!" said King, "some of our friends here tonight don't know what that means, but they do know that they need Theosophy in order to explain life as they see it, which is a pretty good direct application of the principle you're talking about."

"Bill," queried Dave, "do you believe that the human being is just a bunch of reflexes owing their corporate existence to the peculiar accident of birth, that there is no soul and, therefore, no immortality?"

"I guess I mostly believe that way now," replied Bill, "because everything seems to point in that direction, and until someone shows me something different I've got to stick to the reputable evidence."

"But," continued Dave, "do you have any evidence *against* Reincarnation? You know you haven't, and you know, too, that if such a thing as the soul exists as the immortal character of every man, it couldn't be proved in the laboratory, anyway. The point I'm trying to make is that there are some subjects that can't even be considered without metaphysics. As a matter of fact, the materialist has a whole metaphysical system. He isn't aware of it because he assumes blindly that the ultimate nature of reality is matter and accident, and that the whole structure of nature is without conceivable design or meaning. It's true that the Theosophist studies metaphysics and has a philosophy, but he studies his metaphysics consciously, realizing the implications of his position. Have you ever read a book by E. A. Burtt, entitled *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science?* It offers convincing proof that all the materialistic speculations, such as the mechanistic theories of the Behaviorists, are grounded on metaphysical positions unconsciously assumed. Our whole argument to the university man is that if you deny the right to inquire beyond the realm of physical senses by means of metaphysics, you will leave out some entirely logical possibilities and hence you are not being really scientific at all."

This sounded impressive and Bill was startled into verbal inactivity for a moment, giving Alayne a chance to enter the conversation.

"I would like to ask you something," she began. "Why do you bother to talk about Theosophy at all? Why are you a good friend

of King's, who thinks so much of Theosophy, and why did you come down here tonight?" her manner making it clear that she was serious.

Bill scratched his left ear meditatively, inspected an evil-looking cigar he had pulled out of his breast pocket, and replaced it. Then he laughed. "Well, I suppose I have to be honest—I seem to be in honest company. I'm just always interested in those things, that's all, and I wish I could believe in them because they would make life seem a lot more worth while, but I can't seem to believe in anything any more, after three years out there, except that it's a good idea to make a lot of money."

"Look, we're making progress," said King in a stage whisper, "but don't let him know you think so or he'll retrogress."

"Well, what I was getting at," said Alayne, "is that there must be some 'scientific' way of explaining why it is that people always do believe in immortality, just naturally, until they've been filled up with a lot of psychology textbooks, and usually *want* to believe in it even after that. All the great religions have been founded on the common belief of human beings that there must be some reason for their living, and that immortality is a fact. How can you explain these universal intuitions, which go back to the beginning of history, unless they are based on some kind of reality?"

"I'll have to grant you another point there," said Bill. "King has used that one on me before and I think it's the strongest argument you have. I'll admit I haven't an answer, but I'm working on it."

Max cleared his throat and the others turned to listen to his contribution, somewhat unexpected on this subject. "I don't see yet though," he said, "how science can make everybody be more happy. When people think they're just like animals they always make trouble for each other, like the war even. I think that comes from people beginning to believe that they have only one life and maybe should get fun quick."

"Yes," Gail took up the point, "sociologists know that no nation can be happy unless the individuals in it have a sense of social responsibility. But people are getting less and less all the time. Just how do you think the universities help to create social responsibility? They have to have that if they want to make the country work, even economically, and if it doesn't work economically, everybody will be poor."

"They have ethics courses and a lot of philosophy," Bill replied defensively. "Most of the professors talk about responsibility."

"Sure, they talk about it," answered King, "but what they say just doesn't hold up because they haven't any basis for the high morality

they recommend. When you tell someone he is an animal, and then tell him he should act like Buddha and Christ were supposed to have acted, he will reply, 'Nuts, I'm an animal, haven't you heard? That sort of stuff would be way out of my line.' And in a case like that it's not the student who is being illogical, either; it's the professor, who expects people to be noble without any real reason for believing in nobility."

"All right, you've got another point," granted Bill. "Most of the philosophy you get out of college creates a pretty disillusioning attitude. But how are your ideas of Theosophy going to do anything practical there?"

"That's easy," said Janice. "All a person needs to do is to realize that Reincarnation and Karma stand a better chance of being true than anything our modern scientists theorize about, partly because they are older ideas, and partly because they fit in better by analogy with all the known laws of nature. Believe me, when a person first begins to consider Reincarnation seriously, it opens up a whole new world to his mind; he sees that there may be some sense to everything, after all."

"He realizes that he can't ask 'physical' proof for Reincarnation and Karma," finished Dave. "But he begins to look around for evidence of an intuitive and rational sort, and he can find plenty."

"I know that," said Bill. "I've often tried to think along from the idea of Reincarnation as a hypothesis just for fun, and it helped to explain why there are such different types of children in the same family, why some people seem to be born honest and others dishonest, and so on. Hey, wait! I'm agreeing with you too much, but I guess part of me wants to agree with you all along the line at that. The trouble is, our blooming professors sound so certain and rattle off so many authorities, we sort of figure they must be right."

"By this time you must have learned that the ones who sound the surest are almost always small-time stuff," added King. "Scientists like Einstein and Henry Fairfield Osborn, and thinkers like Whitehead, don't pretend that they have answered all the questions, or that immortality may not be true. They're just doing their jobs and hoping for more light as they go along. What we're really discussing here, though, isn't just professors in the university. We're really dealing with the whole content and spirit of modern education, because the universities train the teachers that you find in the primary and secondary schools. If the kids who grow up had a chance to be reminded from time to time that perhaps the whole bunch of ideas we Theosophists call materialism may be only a passing phase, that

there are other alternatives to the implications they suggest in regard to man's nature, they really would have a chance to think for themselves and build their own philosophy as they go along."

"I've been thinking of something that seems really important to us Theosophists, even though it may not mean anything to Bill," said Martinez. "If he will forgive me for suggesting it, I think he has been a little bit impressed by what he would call our 'faith' in our ideas. If the materialists can have so much faith in their beliefs that they can convince people almost against their will sometimes, I should think that theosophists who can show others they have a real faith founded on reasonable ideas can be a much stronger influence in proportion to their numbers."

"Well, our time's up," said Alayne. "I hope you will come back again, Bill. We really just felt around the fringes of the problem of education, but perhaps later on we can take up specific subjects, like Psychology and Biology, and call some of their basic ideas on to the stand for serious questioning. You know, Theosophy is not just a set of theories. H. P. Blavatsky, and the magazine THEOSOPHY, in its way, have provided us with a tremendous collection of hard facts, which make it seem probable that in the near future the cycle of scientific materialism will have to let itself be decently buried, just like the cycle of Catholic theology of the Middle Ages."

GOOD DISCOURSE

Truth is spherical, and seen differently according to the culture, temperament and disposition of those who survey it from their individual standpoint. Of two or more sides, none can be absolutely right, and conversation fails if it find not the central truth from which all radiate; debate is angular, conversation circular and radiant of the underlying unity. Who speaks deeply excludes all possibility of controversy. His affirmation is self-sufficient; his assumption final, absolute. Thus holding himself above the arena of dispute he gracefully settles a question by speaking so home to the core of the matter as to undermine the premise upon which an issue had been taken. For whoso speaks to the personality dives beneath the grounds of difference, and deals face to face with principles and ideas.

Good discourse sinks differences and seeks agreements. It avoids argument, by finding a common basis of agreement; and thus escapes controversy by rendering it superfluous. —BRONSON ALCOTT.

ALLEGORY AND PHILOSOPHY

QUESTION: What is the difference between analogy and allegory, and why is allegory not now more widely used in the presentation of Theosophy?

Answer: Analogy helps one to understand difficult or unfamilar conceptions by likening them to a known idea or process in nature. This method takes advantage of the fact that all things have elements in common, more or less. In drawing an analogy one compares similar properties or relations.

In allegories, truths are couched in symbolical form. Without the key to their symbolism, allegories may seem to be quite meaningless, or only stories. Allegories appeal to the soul and may be intuitively grasped; but if the eye of Soul is veiled by misconceptions and prejudices, the allegory misses its mark.

Can we not see, then, one reason why Theosophy is not stated more in allegorical terms? The world is full of misunderstood allegories; what is needed is the *key* by which they may be understood.

In some times and circumstances, the use of allegory and parable is necessary. Simple people may profit more from allegory than from a philosophical or intellectual presentation of truth which they cannot appreciate. There are tribes who "are not yet ripe for any truth," and allegories guide such races to right living. But for men of the Fifth Race, in whom *Manas* is aroused, allegory may be misleading when not merely childish.

Writing on "Seership," Mr. Judge gives further reason for studying straight philosophy:

> In ancient days it was all very well for mystics to write figuratively so as to keep sacred things from the profane. Then symbolism was rife in the air with mysticism, and all the allegories were understood at once by those for whom they were intended. But times have changed. In this materialistic age it is known that the wildest misconceptions exist in the minds of many who are mystically and spiritually inclined. The generality of mystics and their followers are not free from the superstitions and prejudices which have in church and science their counterpart. Therefore in my humble opinion there can be no justification for writing allegorically on mysticism, and, by publication, placing such writings within reach of all. To do so is positively mischievous. If allegorical writings and misleading novels are intended to popularize mysticism by removing existing prejudices, then the writers ought to express their motives. It is an open question whether the benefit resulting from such popu-

> larization is not more than counterbalanced by the injury worked to helpless votaries of mysticism, who are misled. (THEOSOPHY VI, 12.)

This question really relates to the educational psychology of the Theosophical Movement. Jesus explained to his disciples that he spoke to the multitude in parables because "this people's heart is waxed gross." The disciples could understand "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," but not the crowd. Buddha, when asked by a monk whether or not there is an Ego, refused to answer. (See *Key,* p. 81.) Plato, in suggesting the laws of Karma and Reincarnation, resorted to myth and allegory (see tenth book of the *Republic*), and in a letter asserted that the highest truths cannot be set down in words. Similarly, H. P. Blavatsky withheld in *Isis Unveiled* explicit discussion of ideas that she was later to expound in detail. The time for these explanations, she said, had not come when *Isis* was written.

It is plain from these illustrations that in some periods of history, the pure metaphysics of certain doctrines is precocious and liable to hopeless distortion, while at other times such disclosures are requirements of intellectual evolution. In dark periods of mind, allegory is all that can be understood, but as Manasic perception emerges, evolving the instruments and materials of abstract thought, less and less allegory is necessary. The cycle beginning in 1875 was quite clearly a time when the mind of the race was to undergo an accelerated development in its powers of abstract thought. Hence *The Secret Doctrine.*

Throughout this work, in almost every discussion of symbolism, H. P. B. is engaged in giving the abstract or metaphysical meaning behind religious allegories. In most cases she finds it necessary to employ Sanscrit terms for these subtle philosophical conceptions, there being no corresponding English words. One might say that *The Secret Doctrine* is a book which restates world-religions in the language of metaphysics.

Compare this aspect of H. P. B.'s mission with the work of Jesus, who was concerned with the turning of metaphysical truth *back into allegory!* He, and other "witnesses on the scene," must have known that cycle we call the "Christian era" would begin with centuries of degradation, making the people "ripe for abuse of occult powers and sorcery of the worst description."

There must be and is direct correspondence between the degree of Manasic or intellectual evolution of a race and the form in which the Wisdom-Religion is brought to that race by the agents of the Theosophical Adepts. Take, for example, the early Greek religion of the Mysteries. In his *De Dione,* Synesius repeats the view of

Aristotle that from the Eleusinian Mysteries, "the initiated learned nothing precisely, but that they received impressions and were put in *a certain frame of mind.*" While there must have been direct occult instruction in the higher degrees of initiation, it was quite natural, among a people so psychic as the Greeks, that the first steps upon the Path would be in the direction of purified feelings and a receptiveness to ennobling thoughts—"a certain frame of mind." Later on, it was the work of Pythagoras and Plato to reduce the popular legends of Greek religion to rational theories and metaphysical conceptions. These great teachers mark the Manasic awakening of the Greek nation. At their hands the meaning behind religious allegories was given philosophic form.

But not all of Plato's doctrines were metaphysical. He, like his predecessors, had to employ image and parable, and to avoid the traditional figures of Greek religion he composed his own myths. This has been partly understood by modern students. Lange, in his *History of Materialism,* observes that in Plato "Socratic Rationalism outruns itself, and in the effort to elevate the sphere of reason high above the sensations, went so far that a relapse into mythical forms became inevitable." This, he adds, should not be regarded as a "weakness," but was the necessary result of dealing with problems "that cannot be treated in any but a figurative method." (I, 73.) Plato's works are literary as well as philosophical masterpieces. He wrote in a popular form because he desired books to be *read.* Insofar as he believed it could be understood, he employed the language of metaphysics, and to suggest the more ultimate truths of the Wisdom-Religion he resorted to mystical allegories.

Plato's immediate disciples and, later on, the Neoplatonists, continued the work of "rationalizing" the allegorical teachings of the past. In commentaries on Plato's works they explained the inner meaning of his myths. The Neoplatonists are often accused by scholars of having corrupted Plato's thought with theurgic elements and an enthusiastic mysticism of which their Master never dreamed, but what they really did was to make his meaning more explicit in the disciplined terms of abstract philosophy. Only the ascendency of Christianity as a dogmatic religion put a stop to their work.

The Middle Ages brought another cycle of allegory, during which all pagan teachings were degraded into the service of the Christian Myth. This was the childhood of modern civilization, and few there were who could understand anything more than the simple fables of materialized religion. But today the time has come to throw off the smothering clouds of misunderstood allegory. In an

article devoted to this subject, "Iconoclasm Towards Illusions," Mr. Judge wrote:

> Were we dealing with children or with a race mind which though dwelling in an adult body is but that of a child, then, indeed, it would be right to lead them on by what may be entirely an illusion. But the day of man's childhood as an immortal being has passed away. He is now grown up, his mind has arrived at the point where it must know, and when, if knowledge be refused, this violation of our being will result in the grossest and vilest superstition or the most appalling materialism. . . .
>
> That "great orphan Humanity," now grown up, no longer needs the toys of a thousand years ago, but requires, and with a voice like the rush of mighty waters demands, that every veil shall be lifted, every lie unveiled, and every light be lighted that can shed a ray upon the remainder of its toilsome road. (THEOSOPHY I, 460-61.)

What were formerly teachings veiled in myth and allegory are now the unequivocal doctrines of the Theosophical philosophy. The present is the cycle of awakened Manasic perception, moving onward toward a more effectual union of the fifth and sixth principles of man's being in the next great Race. With the Theosophical philosophy there is provided, however, an entirely new symbolism, to take the place of the old—the spiritual imagery of *The Voice of the Silence*. So long as man has a dual existence, subjective and objective—so long, that is, as there remain hidden depths of the spirit to be fathomed within himself—just so long will there be need of symbolism and allegory. But with each progressive step on the ladder of mental and moral evolution, the order of the symbols must change. What was once form and figure—the allegory of the past—is now realized through metaphysical ideas. What in the past was not known even to the speculative imagination of ordinary men, is now suggested by the subtleties of occult cipher, the language of the soul.

KEY TO PROGRESS

Every revolution was first a thought in one man's mind, and when the same thought occurs to another man it is the key to that era. Every reform was once a private opinion, and when it shall be a private opinion again, it will solve the problem of the age.

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Special Obligation" of Theosophists

Walter Lippmann once wrote, in a moment of inspiration, that the worst thing about war is the kind of public opinion it produces. Thought is the plane of action, and the first responsibility of those who cherish the ideal of brotherhood is to preserve for the future the motives and quality of thinking that will some day build the foundations for an enduring peace among the peoples of the world. America is fortunate in having among its publicists and editors not a few men who recognize and are assuming this responsibility, lest all that Americans believe they are fighting for be lost. Theosophists will find much encouragement in the January editorial of *Common Sense,* a journal that has maintained the even temper of true liberalism throughout the troubled months and years preceding American entry into the war. The editors say:

> If the war is not to mean the degeneration of our civilization into a mere savage struggle to burn and kill, it will be because it is fought in the name of intellectual freedom and human brotherhood, and because these ideals are kept alive. Those of us who are dedicated to their realization have a special obligation to apply them day by day to the war and all the issues of the moment.

A Social Disease

> Let us never forget Sherman's simple aphorism that war is hell. As we take up this deadly enterprise let us not accept our enemies' premise that war is noble, or beautiful, or the highest expression of man's activity as a social animal. War is the deliberate infliction of pain, systematic destruction, organized hatred and death. The pacifists are right in branding it as utterly evil; they are wrong in treating it as a matter of the individual conscience rather than as a social disease.
>
> We cannot at this time settle the ancient philosophical argument of ends and means, and the lesser evil. But we can and must hate war more than we hate our enemies.
>
> We can and must keep in mind the suffering we are causing to millions of innocent victims, fellow members of the human family. We can and must remember that the two thousand year old teaching "love thy enemies" is still the highest ethic we know, however difficult. . . .
>
> There is no assurance that this will be a "war to end war." But we must seek to make it so, even though we failed the last time. There is no assurance that we can establish "the four freedoms—everywhere in the world," but unless we try, we have no dynamic to set over against the dynamic of our enemies' new order. . . .

A Civil War

This war in which we are now engaged is a civil war. Nowhere is that better seen than in the case of the Finns, who are now in effect our enemies. We cannot hate the Finns. We know we have too much in common with them. Even our ideals are theirs. *This is a civil war, in which brother is fighting brother, neighbor is fighting neighbor, for the right to establish a common government.*

These neighbors may be thousands of miles apart, of different races and speech and traditions. The pattern which the German and Japanese and Italian leaders would impose on the world (like the pattern which the Russian leaders, who happen to be on our side, would impose) is one we cannot accept. It is because we believe in a pattern of freedom and equality that we feel we must not lose this civil war. But if we forget the pattern, if we don't realize that it is a civil war, then we might as well accept defeat, and see what kind of pattern our enemies will impose. And if we forget that our enemies are members of a common human family—if we merely give way to hate and seek to destroy and dominate—then we, like those we fight, will be the enemies of the commonwealth of which we all should be a part. . . .

War and Peace

If we are to win a victory for our way of life, *it must be by other than military means.* All that military means can accomplish is to convince the peoples of the Axis that they cannot win, and that continuation of the war can only prolong their agony. Once again we can only win the war as we show we are capable of winning the peace —that we are, in fact, building the peace as we fight the war—that our kind of peace is a peace in whose benefits all peoples, victors and vanquished, can share. . . .

The task of those who seek to apply reasoned intelligence and the love of freedom, even to a world at war, may be summed up as follows:

1. To seek the truth of head and heart, and not give way to propagandas of intolerant hatred and intolerant nationalism.
2. To keep the goals of human decency and human brotherhood before us, as the only goals worth the sacrifices we shall have to make.
3. To seek to bring good out of evil, a new world order of peace and plenty out of war, a truer democracy out of the resolution which has now unified us.

That there are in America sufficient readers to support and to keep in publication a national magazine devoted to the promulgation of these high moral conceptions is one of the most encouraging facts on the present horizon. The clear thinking to which *Common*

Sense is devoted atones in some measure for the tragedies of war, recalling a passage in Robert Crosbie's *Answers to Questions on the Ocean of Theosophy:*

> The present war has thrown us out of the hard ruts of thinking. If by the destruction of millions of men, other millions are brought to think as they have never thought before, if they are made to sacrifice, to see the use and benefit of sacrifice, then much will be gained for the world. If, too, a new basis is established, then those who have died as a vicarious atonement for us will come again at a time infinitely more favorable than it has ever been before for mankind. There is nothing lost; no labor is in vain (p. 160).

Is Freedom "Christian"?

Democratic societies existed before the advent of the Christian religion, and free communities of men and women will exist long after the sectarian dogmas of present western religion are forgotten. In fact, there is reason to believe that the greatest single obstacle to social progress in the West has been the claim to exclusive truth asserted by Christian ecclesiastics. It is peculiarly unfortunate, therefore, that columnists and other commentators should now be attempting to identify the cause of Christianity as the cause of freedom in the present world struggle. One such writer, Ted LeBerthon, delivers the judgment that:

> . . . democracy cannot survive if it does not accept the Ten Commandments, which Jews and Christians have in common, as the basis of all its civil laws. And the first commandment, foundation of all the others, stands for belief in God, and also holds that one shall worship no other god.

Confusing Views

This seems to imply that in self-protection a Democracy should prohibit worship of all "gods" other than the god of the Old Testament. As if to support this view, Mr. LeBerthon contends that "the founding fathers of our country, in holding for freedom of worship, said nothing of freedom not to worship." Now what, exactly, does "freedom of religion" mean, in the light of these statements? In order to survive, Democracy must make belief in the God of the Ten Commandments the foundation of its civil law. But there should be no "coercion" exerted to make people worship in any particular way. Yet freedom "not to worship" is not regarded as part of the American tradition. Mr. LeBerthon has constructed quite a puzzle for his readers. He ends by saying:

> I think religion should be restored to education, that Christians and Jews shall be brought up with an understanding of their common heritage, the one God who revealed himself; that both may return to theology and be weaned from all philosophies which do not start with Him and His love and illumination, or at least ascend to him. (Los Angeles *Daily News,* Dec. 30, 1941.)

Those "Heretical" Founding Fathers

As always, advocates of returning instruction in "religion" to the public schools neglect to say what kind of religion and by whom it should be taught. As a Catholic, Mr. LeBerthon might like to see the administration of moral education in the hands of the Roman Church; or, if he is "liberal," would agree upon some division of responsibility among the major sects. But what of parents who are members of minority groups not desiring for their children instruction in any of the sectarian interpretations of Chistianity? What of the Freethinkers? If the Founding Fathers are to be invoked in this discussion, why not recall what they actually thought? Benjamin Franklin distrusted the revealed religion of his day, and said so, while Thomas Jefferson edited an edition of the New Testament for his own use as a rationalist and disbeliever in supernaturalism. And let us not forget Tom Paine, who was another of the "Fathers." During the presidency of John Adams, the United States concluded a treaty with Tripoli which, in its eleventh article, asserted that "the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion." The Declaration of Independence refers, not to the Ten Commandments of the Christian Bible, but to "Nature and Nature's God." All such attempts as Mr. LeBerthon's to identify Christianity with American Democracy should be condemned as subversive of the real traditions of the American people, and never allowed to pass without forceful objection.

Compelling the Flag Salute

Another instance of decline in the vigilance of Americans for preserving their religious liberties is reflected in a decision of the United States Supreme Court rendered in June, 1940. The Court held that public school authorities have the power to compel pupils to salute the national flag, despite their sincerity in refusing on the ground of religious belief. Now it may seem silly to some people that the members of the sect called "Jehovah's Witnesses" should object to their children saluting the flag of their country, but in matters of conscience, it is dangerous to judge others in terms of the apparent

triviality of their beliefs. Nevertheless, the ruling of the Supreme Court, delivered by Justice Felix Frankfurter, was that the children should be compelled to salute the flag in the interest of national unty! The Court refused to deny to the State of Pennsylvania its power to require school children to participate in an exercise designed to foster "patriotic impulses." The Court asserted that the State has the right to attempt to "awaken in the child's mind considerations as to the significance of the flag," even if the means chosen are contrary to the religious scruples of the children as taught by their parents.

Fallacy of Compulsion

A portion of the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan Stone, now Chief Justice, may be here reproduced as indicating the views of many thoughtful Americans with regard to this issue:

> History teaches us that there have been but few infringements of personal liberty by the state which have not been justified, as they are here, in the name of righteousness and the public good, and few which have not been directed, as they are now, at politically helpless minorities. . . . The Constitution may well elicit expressions of loyalty to it and to the government which it created, but it does not command such expressions or otherwise give any indication that compulsory expressions of loyalty play any such part in our scheme of government as to override the constitutional protection of freedom of speech and religion. And while such expression of loyalty, when voluntarily given, may promote national unity, it is quite another matter to say that their compulsory expression by children in violation of their own and their parents' religious convictions can be regarded as playing so important a part in our national unity as to leave school boards free to exact it despite the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion. The very terms of the Bill of Rights preclude, it seems to me, any reconciliation of such compulsions with the constitutional guarantees by a legislative declaration that they are more important to the public welfare than the Bill of Rights. . . .

"Sensible Adjustment"

> Here we have such a small minority entertaining in good faith a religious belief, which is such a departure from the usual course of human conduct, that most persons are disposed to regard it with little toleration or concern. In such circumstances careful scrutiny of legislative efforts to secure conformity of belief and opinion by compulsory affirmation of the desired belief, is especially needful if civil rights are to be maintained. . . . With such scrutiny I cannot say that the inconveniences which may attend some sensible adjustment

> of school discipline in order that the religious convictions of these children may be spared, presents a problem so momentous or pressing as to outweigh the freedom from compulsory violation of religious faith which has been thought worthy of constitutional protection.

"National Unity" is the reason given for forcing these children to participate in a program prescribed by the public schools of Pennsylvania. It is not difficult to imagine similar reasoning which would demand common participation of children in a prayer to the chosen "God" of the majority, again, in the interest of "National Unity." If Democracy is dependent on acceptance of the First Commandment, as Mr. LeBerthon contends, then surely it is the path of wisdom to compel belief in the God of the Old Testament! These are days when our liberties may be slipping away from us, and being replaced by legal compulsions to uniformity in the name of the freedom they destroy. Only an alert public opinion and an aroused spirit of true liberalism will be able to preserve the real traditions of America through these years of trial.

"Psychics"—a la the Scientific American

Copying the cunning ways of advertising copy writers, the editors of the *Scientific American* titled a page of reviews in its September number with the words, "Books on Psychic Phenomena," and beneath a fetchingly "psychic" picture of Joseph M. Dunninger, threw dignity to the wind by adding: "YOU TOO Can Investigate The SUPERNATURAL"! Some of the works listed are more or less creditable treatments of the field of psychic phenomena. J. B. Rhine's latest book, *Extra-Sensory Perception After Sixty Years,* is called "a summary of what has been achieved so far . . . a solid serious study." Garland's autobiographical *Forty Years of Psychic Research* is accurately said to be without theory and without emotion; Garland, of course, like every honest investigator, acknowledged the phenomena, as well as his inability to explain it. The doctoral thesis of John F. Thomas, *Beyond Normal Condition,* which won Mr. Thomas a Ph.D. from Duke University, describes "communications" he obtained through mediums (Reviewed in Lookout XXV, 522). Besides other books, there is G. N. M. Tyrrell's excellent *Science and Psychical Phenomena,* already noted in these pages (see Lookout, XXVII, 184). The reviewer seems to agree with Mr. Tyrrell that "if the world is to be saved from materialism, knowledge of man's psychic processes must be extended." Except for this last work, the approach of the books listed on this page is entirely

phenomenalistic, with the following glamorous passage by the editors to hint at the subject-matter of psychic research:

> We want to know if such things as phantoms, ghosts, spirits or vampires actually visit us. We seek the facts concerning ectoplasmic and other supernatural demonstrations of a physical nature.

On Poltergeists

As reported here some months ago, the *Scientific American* in its own special way is carrying on a research project in "Psychics" assisted by the peerless Dunninger, spook-exposer extraordinary. The December number contains a sprightly account of how Dunninger, without twitching a muscle, was able to duplicate poltergeist phenomena with a fidelity that frightened an innocent bystander half out of his wits. While the writer, in paying great compliments to the Dunninger skill in prestidigitation, does not exactly say that poltergeist phenomena are an impossibility, the reader is obviously meant to get that impression. However, should unquestionable proof of its reality be available tomorrow—which is not likely—the *Scientific Monthly* would be Johnny-on-the-spot, saying, "Yes, we suspected it ourselves; we've been investigating it right along." In fact, the ostentation with which this popular journal is carrying on its experiments makes one wonder if the editors are really serious about getting at the facts, or are using this sort of material because of the "human interest" angle involved. Incidentally, the book review page on psychic research which appeared in the September number was printed again in November, without change of a comma —a handy way to fill up space.

"On Behalf of Talking Drums"

The story of a young English missionary's efforts to preserve the vanishing art of drum talk among the natives of the Belgian Congo is told in the New York *Post* (Oct. 31). The writer, George Weller, quotes the missionary, John F. Carrington, on the declining use of the drum telegraph: "As soon as the tribesmen leave the villages and get acquainted with the white man's telephone and telegraph they begin to disdain the drum. They even forget their drum name, given to them by their fathers at birth." One would expect the drum language to be made up of contractions or abbreviations, but according to Mr. Weller, "The drum language is more elaborate than human speech."

> In drum language [he writes] every spoken and written word becomes a full phrase. The reason is that each drum, like the spoken

language of the fisher folk, uses only two tones, obtained by hollowing wood to different depths upon opposite sides of the drum's sound-hole.

The high note is called the man's voice because it carries farther and the low is called the woman's. One drumstick strikes the woman's side of the drum, the other the man's—each blow corresponding to a syllable in an ordinary language. But since many spoken words when drummed would sound identical, names are expanded into long synonyms in order to bring out variations. Thus the jungle telegraph has become a kind of poetry rather than cablese and longer rather than shorter than human speech.

Drum "Poetry"

Some of the translated "drum words" are revealing:

The polite drum word for a white is "white man spirit from the forest," but until recently the synonym, "death on the river," was common. Grief is "tears from eyes and crying from mouth." To express death, the drums were saying long before missionaries like Carrington arrived: "Spirit has left body and body has returned to ground."

This article adds to the many evidences that the modern Christian world is changing its attitude toward so-called "savages" and their customs. Compare, for instance, the spirit of the missionary Carrington of today with the fanatics who brought Christianity to Lapland. Clyde Fisher, in the *National Geographic* for November, 1939, relates that "When the Lapps were Christianized, they were taught that the use of the magic drum was sinful; and they were persuaded —even compelled—to destroy their drums." But Carrington has encouraged the Congo natives to revere their traditional practices, helping them to preserve an ancient form of communication that may some day provide precious clues of the past to enlightened anthropologists. It may even be recognized that these quaint poetic expressions of the drum language are artifacts of the universal religion of antiquity, of a philosophy of soul which has never died out.

Science Education

It is slowly dawning on scientists that science belongs not to them alone. . . . The science writers of the press agree. They have to take their public as they find it. That public is inadequately educated in science, for all the courses given in high schools and colleges. As a result scientific terms have to be explained in simple, homely analogies, which, just because they are analogies, can never be wholly sound.

The difficulty of the science writers is acute when it comes to explaining relativity, atomic physics and the much simpler subject of

> genetics. Even botanists, geologists and biologists are bewildered when they read an article or a book on relativity or quantum theory —proof enough that something is wrong with the way that science is taught.—(New York *Times,* Dec. 24, 1941).

Such is the comment of Waldemar Kaempffert, New York *Times* science editor. He analyzes the present system of science education, revealing failings that scientists themselves do not generally recognize:

> The reason for this backwardness is to be found in the pedagogical approach. The teacher of biology conducts his classes as if he had fifty potential Darwins before him—young men and women who are handled as if they are to become zoologists, botanists or geneticists when, as a matter of fact, not 2 per cent of them develop into professional scientists. Some field and laboratory work is clearly necessary if only to drive home what the scientific attitude means and how scientific evidence is to be appraised. But, unless the students have decided to take up science as a career, a broader educational program is called for.

Correlation With Other Subjects

The desirability of linking science with "non-scientific" subjects, so sorely felt by college students as a necessity to clarify the meaning of their studies, is stressed by Mr. Kaempffert. He is groping for something that will bring unity to scientific knowledge in the minds of students and scientists alike. Why should not science be taught as the humanities are taught?

> English, history and philosophy are now taught as cultural subjects. So should it be with science. After some laboratory and field work there should be lectures on the history of science, some effort at correlating philosophy with physics, chemistry and biology, some revelation of the manner in which the human mind has progressed in its thinking about matter, trees, stars, the winds, the universe and life.

The Purpose of Life

Now come two most interesting questions. Mr. Kaempffert says:

> There are old cries to be answered—cries that have been wrung from human throats ever since there were thinking brains and voices. What does it all mean? Why am I here?

These are questions to which scientists will find no answer in the laboratory, in tissue wincing under the scalpel, nor from the equations by which theorists bring mathematical order to the motions of matter. These are questions raised, not in the terms of physics and form, but of *consciousness,* and the answer must be sought in the

same realm. While very few scientists have shown either the perception or the daring which is necessary to proclaim the need for philosophy in dealing with the purpose and meaning of life, more and more workers like Mr. Kaempffert are asking the questions that must surely lead them to philosophy in the end.

Rising Cycle

The recognition of the importance of philosophical problems is the first step in transition to a truly philosophical attitude of mind. Modern science, in its rise to pre-eminence as the authority of the age, only reflects the cycle of intellectual evolution now rapidly coming to a close. The spiritual perception of the ancients was sundered into the differentiated channels of the five senses during this period, with progressive forgetfulness of the intuitive sources of knowledge that were available to men before being so deeply submerged in matter. But today, as H. P. B. has written,

> . . . We are in the 5th race, and we have already passed the turning or *axial* point of our "sub-race cycle." Eventually as the current phenomena and the increase of sensitive organisms in our age go to prove, this Humanity will be moving swiftly on the path of pure spirituality, and will reach the apex (of *our* Race) at the end of the 7th sub-race. . . . the latter half of our Round,—as shown to correspond with the 1st half of the 3rd,—must have already begun to be once more overshadowed by renascent "primordial" spirituality, which, at the end of the 4th Round, will have nearly eclipsed our actual mentality—in the sense of cold *human* Reason.

Signs of Transition

> On the principle of that same law of correspondence, . . . civilized humanity will soon begin to show itself, if even less rational" *on the worldly plane,* at any rate more *Deva*-like than ape-like"—as we now actually are, and that in the most distressing degree. (Theosophy VII, 233.)

Already are there evident some signs of spiritual stirrings, taking the form of vague questionings and expressions of scepticism with regard to the nineteenth century optimism which claimed that science would reform the world. The entire movement of modern thought is toward a new foundation in another order of reality than that of physical matter, so inordinately worshiped by the scientists of the past. Every progressive school in the various sciences is becoming more and more *psychological* in its first principles, and such serious critics of the old theory of scientific method as David Lindsay Watson (*Scientists Are Human*) have gone even further in setting

up ethical criteria for determining the truth-content of the sciences. In just such ways as these is the great transition predicted by the teachers of Theosophy now going on.

FAMILY KARMA

It is a fact of common observation that husband and wife who have been married for many years seem to grow more and more alike in many respects, physically as well as psychologically. From the viewpoint of occult psychology, this is to be explained by an application of the general laws of family resemblance described in *Isis Unveiled* (I, 385-97). There must be a constant interchange of physical and astral "lives" between married couples, resulting in even a partial unity of the kamic principle. The common participation of the members of a family in what has been called "family karma" may also be explained in this way. First accumulations of a body of scientific evidence which, when more complete, should suggest to scientific investigators the operation of laws of this order, are found in the researches of Karl Pearson, who noted "a possible correlation . . . between the length of life of husband and wife." The fact that, statistically speaking, husband and wife tend to live to about the same age, led to further studies of biological similarities between husband and wife, disclosing that married persons also tend to die of a common cause in the case of four diseases—tuberculosis, influenza and pneumonia, heart diseases and cancer.

MEDICAL ENIGMA

According to the *Medical Record* for Oct. 15, 1941, a study of deaths in Washington County, Maryland, showed that in the case of husbands dying of tuberculosis, more than 17 per cent of the wives died of the same cause, while only 5½ per cent of the wives of men dying of other causes succumbed to tuberculosis. Similar ratios prevailed in cases of deaths from cancer. Mutual infection may account in part for man and wife dying of the same disease in the case of tuberculosis, influenza and pneumonia, but this explanation cannot apply to cancer, unless there is an unknown infective factor in the production of cancer—a question on which doctors disagree. The reason why husbands and wives are commonly affected "remains an enigma" to orthodox medical understanding, and this conclusion of the *Medical Record* will have to stand until doctors begin to consider seriously the psychic factors of disease in connection with the Theosophical teaching of family karma.